

**REMARKS**

Claims are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10-13, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28-31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, and 46-49 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 10, 12, 19, 24, 28, 30, 37, 42, 46, and 48 are amended herein. Claims 9, 27, and 45 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the claims as originally filed.

The amendments to the claims are believed to place the application in condition for allowance, and entry thereof is earnestly solicited. In the alternative, entry of the amendments to the claims is requested in order to place the application in better condition for appeal. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

**Response to Arguments:**

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The final Office Action asserts at page 15 that Mills does show enlarging a display area corresponding to the identifying information and displaying only the single display area and deleting the other display areas at column 8, line 52 through column 9, line 5. To the contrary, it is submitted that Mills, rather, describes only returning the SDF to the video window 20 at column 8, line 52 through column 9, line 5. In fact, displaying only the single display area and deleting the other display areas would make no sense in the context of Mills, since the SDF is dragged into or out of video window 20 as needed for editing purposes. If the other, i.e. non-SDF display areas were deleted, the user would have no way of knowing where to put the SDF next.

**OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS:**

Claims 1 and 6 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1 and 6 were amended in substantial accord with the Examiner's suggestions. The Examiner's suggestions are appreciated. Lines 11 and 12 of claim 1, however, indicated as item 4(b) in the Office Action, are submitted to be correct, since a display of the first item is mentioned immediately above. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:**

Claims 6, 7, 8, 19, 20, 21, 37, 38, 39, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 6, 7, 8, 19, 20, 21, 37, 38, 39, and 42 were amended to make them more definite, in substantial accord with the Examiner's suggestions. The

Examiner's suggestions are appreciated. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

Claims 6, 7, 8, 24, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mills et al., US-5,237,648 (hereinafter "Mills").

Claims 6, 24, and 42 recite,

"said control unit, when the identifying information corresponding to the display area is specified through said operation unit, enlarges said display area corresponding to the identifying information, displays only said display area and deletes other display areas"

Mills neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests enlarging a display area corresponding to the identifying information and displaying only the single display area and deleting the other display areas, as recited in claim 6. As Mills, rather, describes at column 8, line 52 through column 9, line 5,

If the SDF is returned to the video window 20, the video source 10 is prompted to automatically return to the video frame position corresponding to the SDF, block 148. As explained above, this feature is particularly useful if the user wants to return to the position of the SDF to further edit a clip list row. For example, if the user had created a video clip sequence and then decided that the clip sequence should begin or end at a different frame, the user would not have to operate hardware trim buttons or goto buttons to change the sequence. To change a begin or end frame, the user would only have to put an SDF from either the begin or end column back in the video window, move the video information to the new frame position using the controllers of the control window 24, grab the new frame from the video window, and drag it over to the position of the old SDF. Likewise, the user could further edit a clip sequence by dragging an SDF from the clip column into the video window, thereby causing the video source 10 to automatically replay the video information in the same loop sequence as the SDF clip sequence, block 148.

Thus, Mills describes only returning the SDF to the video window 20 at column 8, line 52 through column 9, line 5. In fact, displaying only the single display area and deleting the other display areas would make no sense in the context of Mills, since the SDF is dragged into or out of video window 20 as needed for editing purposes. If the other, i.e. non-SDF display areas were deleted, the user would have no way of knowing where to put the SDF next. Claims 6, 24, and 42 are submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 24, and 42 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 7 and 8 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 8 is also earnestly solicited.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of the present application.

Claim 1 recites,

"wherein the indication of displaying the second item of information is given by dragging a link information indicated by a specified character key word displayed in the first display area into the second display area."

Mills neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests that an indication of displaying the second item of information is given by dragging a link information indicated by a specified character key word displayed in the first display area into the second display area, nor is it rendered obvious in view of the present specification. Mills, rather, moves the images in the small window to the big display area of video window 20. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 3 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is also earnestly solicited.

Rejection of claim 2:

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of the present application, and further in view of Kraus et al., US 6,266,684. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and adds further distinguishing elements. Mills neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests that an indication of displaying the second item of information is given by dragging a link information indicated by a specified character key word displayed in the first display area into the second display area, nor is it rendered obvious in view of the present specification, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Kraus does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Mills with respect to claim 2. Thus, even if the references were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result.

Kraus, in fact, teaches away from the incorporation of links at column 1, lines 11-16, where he describes web page creation as "historically require(ing) manual entry of HTML code and plain text to define the structure and content of the page and to establish hyperlinks to other computer resources. As a result, the author of a web page generally must have a relatively deep understanding of HTML." Links, a.k.a. hypertext, are part of HTML.

Furthermore, according to Kraus, at column 1, lines 17-30,

Creation of multi-frame pages, i.e., pages divided into multiple sub-pages that display the contents of multiple intranet or internet resources, requires an even more developed understanding of HTML. Multi-frame web pages commonly are used to display, at the same time, an HTML page and the contents of another web resource, such as an HTML page, an image, or a graphics file, accessible through a hyperlink in the HTML page. Creating this type of multi-frame page requires manual entry not only of HTML code and plain text defining the HTML page, but also HTML code defining the number and layout of the multiple frames and instructing the computer to display the contents of the hyperlinked resource in a frame other than the frame displaying the HTML file.

There is thus no way Kraus is encouraging the incorporation of links, after a soliloquy like that, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. Claim 2 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is also earnestly solicited.

Rejection of claims 9, 27, and 45:

Claims 9, 27, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Westerink et al., US 5,684,511 (hereinafter "Westerlink"). The subject matters of claims 9, 27, and 45 have been incorporated into claims 10, 28, and 46, which were indicated to contain allowable subject matter in the final Office Action. The rejection is thus submitted to be moot.

Rejection of claims 12, 13, 30, 31, 48, and 49:

Claims 12, 13, 30, 31, 48, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Kraus and Westerink. The subject matters of claims 10, 28, and 46, which were indicated to contain allowable subject matter in the final Office Action, have been incorporated substantially into claims 12, 13, 30, 31, 48, and 49. The rejection is thus submitted to be moot.

Rejection of claims 19, 21, 25, 26, 37, 39, 43 and 44:

Claims 19, 21, 25, 26, 37, 39, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of the present application.

Claims 19 and 37 recite,

"wherein the indication of displaying the second item of information is given by dragging a link information indicated by a specified character key word displayed in the first display area into the second display area."

Mills neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests that an indication of displaying the second item of information is given by dragging a link information indicated by a specified character key

word displayed in the first display area into the second display area, nor is it rendered obvious in view of the present specification, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claims 19 and 37 are thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19 and 37 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 21, 25, 26, 39, 43 and 44 depend from either claim 19 or claim 37, and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 21, 25, 26, 39, 43 and 44 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 25, 26, 39, 43 and 44 is also earnestly solicited.

Rejection of claims 20 and 38:

Claims 20 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of the present application, and further in view of Krause. Claims 20 and 38 depend from claims 19 and 37, respectively, and add further distinguishing elements. Mills neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests that an indication of displaying the second item of information is given by dragging a link information indicated by a specified character key word displayed in the first display area into the second display area, nor is it rendered obvious in view of the present specification, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Kraus does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Mills with respect to claims 20 and 38. Thus, even if the references were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claims 20 and 38 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of to claims 20 and 38 is also earnestly solicited.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 10, 11, 28, 29, 46, and 47 contain allowable subject matter at page 14 of the Office Action. Claims 10, 28, and 46 have been placed in independent form, and claims 10, 11, 28, 29, 46, and 47 are thus submitted to be allowable.

**Conclusion:**

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10-13, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28-31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, and 46-49 are allowable over the cited references. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/764,302

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 285005

By:

  
Thomas E. McKiernan  
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501